

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. Claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. patent 5,394,556 to Oprescu.

With respect to the rejection of Claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Oprescu, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

It is initially noted that each of the independent claims is amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein. Specifically, independent claim 1 now clarifies differences between the generated first and second reserve commands. Independent claim 1 now clarifies that the first reserve command is for:

permitting transmission of commands from the controller device sending the first reserve command to a first target device that accepts the first reserve command from the controller device, and for inhibiting communication between the first target device and all other target devices and all other controller devices[.]

Independent claim 1 now also further clarifies the operation of the second reserve command by reciting that command for:

permitting transmission of commands from the controller device to the first target device, and for permitting transmission of a specified command to said first target device from other controller devices[.]

The other independent claims are amended to recite similar features.

The claim amendments are presented to clarify the two different commands, along the lines of the disclosed “reserve command” noted in the present specification at the bottom of page 70 and the “vendor dependent reserve commands” noted at page 78 of the present specification, as non-limiting examples.

As noted in the present specification with respect to the above-noted commands, a first reserve command can permit transmission of commands between a controller device and

a first target device and inhibit communication between the first target device and all other target devices and all other controller devices. In that operation the first target device can be reserved to communicate with only the controller device in a reserve mode.<sup>1</sup> However, applicants of the present invention recognized that the use of such a reserve command can lead to certain inconveniences noted in Figures 27 and 28 in the present specification.<sup>2</sup>

Therefore, to address such inconveniences in having a reserve command, as a further feature a second reserve command, for example the vendor dependent reserve command noted on page 78 of the present specification, can be generated. That second reserve command allows the transmission of a specified command to the first target device from other controller devices. Such a second command can provide a benefit such that even when a target device is reserved by a controller so as to reject in principal commands from any other controller, that reserved target can accept certain commands from other controllers, such as AKE-related commands so that information affecting operations required by an IEEE 1394 system will not be blocked, to thereby enhance the availability of an IEEE 1394 system.<sup>3</sup>

The use of the two different commands and what the two different commands allow as far as communication between a first target device, other target devices, a controller device, and other controller devices is believed to be clarified in each of the independent claims, and is believed to clearly distinguish over the teachings in Oprescu.

The outstanding Office Action now cites the teachings in Oprescu with respect to disclosing a bus denied signal BD as corresponding to the claimed second reserve command and a bus grant signal BG as corresponding to the claimed first reserve command. However,

---

<sup>1</sup> See also for example the present specification at page 71, line 2 et. seq.

<sup>2</sup> See also the present specification at page 74, line 2 et. seq.

<sup>3</sup> See also the present specification at page 82, lines 8-14.

applicants respectfully submit that clearly those commands in Oprescu do not meet the claim limitations.

More particularly, the bus denied signal BD in Oprescu does not appear to allow any transmission of a specified command between any devices, but appears to only inhibit transmission of commands between first and second target devices. In contrast to the teachings in Oprescu, the claimed "second reserve command" still permits transmission of specified commands to the first target devices from other control devices.

As noted above the claims as currently written allow two different types of reserve commands to be generated, and those two different types of reserve commands are believed to clearly distinguish over the generation of the bus denied signal BD and the bus grant signal BG in Oprescu.

In such ways, each of the claims are believed to distinguish over the applied art to Oprescu.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40073

Surinder Sachar  
Registration No. 34,423

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/03)  
BDL:SNS:asa

I:\ATTYSNS\20's\203750\203750US-AM1.DOC